

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 10/698,882 | 10/31/2003 | Henry E. Troost | H0006335 (1161.1153101) | H0006335 (1161.1153101) 2015 | |
| 128 | 7590 10/26/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| HONEYWE | ELL INTERNATIONA | NORMAN, MARC E | | | |
| 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245 | | | 3744 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Andless Commercial | 10/698,882 | TROOST ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Marc E. Norman | 3744 | | | |
| - The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address - | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2005. | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This | This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 15-30</u> is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13,15,16 and 20-30</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>17 and 19</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>18</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | in from consideration. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | • | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | _ | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | · == | • | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) 🔲 Other: | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/698,882

Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 17 January 2005, with respect to claims 1-5, 8,

Page 2

11, 18, and 20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of these claims

have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17 and 19 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jalics.

As per claim 17, Jalics discloses a gas burner for a heating system having a burner and a

flue, wherein a sensor 98 monitors the flame to indicate the presence or absence of a flame,

thereby indicating whether the flue is blocked (column 2, lines 7-10, 44-48; column 7, lines 40-

44; etc.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 10/698,882

Art Unit: 3744

Page 3

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jalics.

As per claim 19, Jalics teaches a burner disposed in a chamber having a flue, a flame sensor monitoring the flame, and a controller determining from the sensor output if the flue is blocked (again, see column 7, lines 40-44). Jalics does not teach the sensor being an optical sensor, although it does teach that various types of sensors might be suitable (column 6, lines 51-53). Official notice is taken that optical flame sensors are common and well-known in the art (see for example Servidio, column 2, lines 30-36) of oil burner controls. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply an optical sensor within the system of Jalics as an alternative means of sensing the flame.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/698,882 Page 4

Art Unit: 3744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 571-272-4812. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on 571-272-4808. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

MARC NORMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER